IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA WESTERN DIVISION

RONALD KUIPER and CONLEY KUIPER,

VS.

No. C06-4009-MWB

Plaintiffs,

Sioux City, Iowa March 12, 2009

.

8:50 a.m.

GIVAUDAN FLAVORS CORP.,

VOLUME 12 OF 12

Defendant.

TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL
BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARK W. BENNETT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, and a jury.

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiffs: KENNETH BLAIR MCCLAIN, ESQ.

STEVEN EDWARD CRICK, ESQ.

Humphrey, Farrington & McClain

Suite 400

221 West Lexington

Independence, MO 64050

DENNIS M. MCELWAIN, ESQ.

Smith & McElwain

Suite 530

505 Fifth Street

Sioux City, IA 51101

For the Defendant: V. THOMAS MEADOR, ESQ.

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius

Suite 2200

300 South Grand Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90071-3132

Court Reporter: Shelly Semmler, RMR, CRR

320 Sixth Street

Sioux City, IA 51101

(712) 233-3846

```
1
               (Proceedings reconvened outside the presence of the
 2
    jury.)
              THE COURT: Okay. Good morning.
                                                 We have counsel
 3
    present in Ronald Kuiper and Conley Kuiper, Plaintiffs, versus
 4
 5
    Givaudan Flavors Corporation, 06-4009.
 6
              Nick, would you close the side door there, please?
 7
    The jury room is a long ways away, but I don't want to take any
 8
    chances.
 9
              And there have been some developments while the jury
10
    has been deliberating. And so I want to give counsel an
11
    opportunity this morning to make any record based on the
12
    developments that they'd like to make.
13
               So, Mr. Meador, be happy to hear from you.
14
              MR. MEADOR: Good morning. Thank you, Your Honor.
                                                                    Ι
15
    have a quick four points to make here. Of course, I might think
16
    of an additional few on my way.
17
              Number one, as the Court now knows, Mr. Kuiper has
18
    passed away yesterday.
19
              First of all, I'd like to thank Mr. McClain for his
2.0
    professionalism and integrity. When he learned about
    Mr. Kuiper's death, he immediately contacted me and said we have
21
22
    to go to the Court. In fact, we jumped in his car and came over
23
    here, so I thank him for that because I think that was, number
24
    one, the right thing to do.
```

Number two, I thank the Court. You were with your

1 daughter yesterday. 2. THE COURT: Yes. And I thank you for the fact you took our 3 MR. MEADOR: call and tried to help us sort through this unexpected issue, 4 and I appreciate that. We're -- we've all talked off the 5 6 record, and we're all in uncharted territory. None of us have 7 had a case at least here where the plaintiff dies literally hours before the jury comes back, and it's a difficult problem. 8 9 Three, I just want to tell the Court you and I share something in common so strongly, and I've read a lot of your 10 11 writings. I believe in the jury system. I may have disagreed 12 with some of your rulings during trial. 13 THE COURT: Of course. MR. MEADOR: Which I did. 14 15 THE COURT: Of course you did. 16 MR. MEADOR: You may have disagreed with the way I 17 tried the case which you did. But the bottom line, maybe 18 because I'm an American history major and I value the 19 Constitution, we still have eight people that decide the verdict 2.0 in this case. And this jury has been unbelievably attentive. 21 They've been unbelievably hard working. I think we're day 6 22 with the jury out. Mr. McClain and I have been having good 23 times in a hotel talking about this case while we're waiting for 24 a call. And amazingly, a call never came with any question or

comments from the jury until Mr. Kuiper passed away.

```
1
               If Mrs. Kuiper was here, I would give her my
                  Even though I'm a defense attorney, I have a
 2
    condolences.
            I recently lost my mom, so I can't imagine what she's
 3
    feeling at this point in time with the stress of a trial and the
 4
 5
    stress of losing her spouse.
              Now, with all that said, as Lyndon Johnson said in the
 6
 7
    1964 elections, it's with a heavy heart -- and I've never done
    this before, but I'd like to move for a mistrial. And basically
 8
 9
    I'm not going to go through all the grounds, but basically I
10
    think we have problems with capacity to sue. We have problems
11
    with standing. We have potentially problems with a wrong cause
    of action.
12
13
              We have other problems potentially related to damages.
14
    If there is a punitive damage award, there's a question of
15
    whether Mrs. Kuiper has standing or -- to get these damages.
16
    And so I think unfortunately because of this change in events,
    we have a situation where this case is kind of a mess through
17
18
    no, you know, fault of the Court or Mr. McClain or my firm.
19
              So anyway, as I said, this is very reluctant, but I
2.0
    feel compelled to -- in the interest of my client to move for a
2.1
    mistrial.
22
                                  Thank you, Mr. Meador.
              THE COURT: Okay.
23
              Mr. McClain?
24
              MR. MCCLAIN: Your Honor, the -- Mr. Meador is right.
25
    There is, to our research, no other court in Iowa that has
```

confronted this precise situation.

2.

2.0

2.1

THE COURT: Is there any court anywhere in the country that has that you're aware of?

MR. MCCLAIN: We have -- we have been looking, and we haven't found any law on that issue. However, the principles involved appear to be clear and reasoning from those principles. We would oppose this motion.

Lutheran Hospital case, 128 Northwest 2d 226, Iowa Supreme

Court, 1964 case, and the cases cited in approval thereafter

which -- which hold that Iowa follows a line of cases which are

based upon a statute which makes it clear that Iowa's law is a

survival statute. It's not a wrongful death statute. The

wrongful death statutes and the jurisdictions that are wrongful

death statutes based on so-called Lord Campbell's Act are cases

which -- are jurisdictions that find a new cause of action is

created upon the death of a plaintiff.

And, therefore, in those jurisdictions where -- that follow Lord Campbell's Act, if a plaintiff dies, the cause of action that he had during life dies with him and a new cause of action is created in his estate.

Iowa is different than that result because it is a survival statute which means that the cause of action that existed at the time of death simply transfers over into the estate of the decedent. And so every claim that the decedent

2.

2.0

had at the time of his death is simply carried on by his estate.

And that's what this case that I just cited to you holds. It holds that the only thing that happens which is not beneficial to Mr. Meador's claim is that the damages become enlarged because of the death of the decedent.

Now, in light of our procedural posture, we do not think that it's advisable or allowable to reopen the record to make that item of damage available to -- for consideration by the jury. However, there's at least a colorable argument that that's the only thing that should happen here. We're not doing that.

In regard to the exemplary damages issue, it's been the longstanding rule in Iowa going back to 1897 -- and I'd cite the Court to the Union Mill versus Prenzler case, 69 Northwest 876, 100 Iowa 540 -- that the death of the plaintiff will not prevent the recovery of exemplary damages which might have been recovered by the decedent himself. So that's Iowa Supreme Court law, good law, going back to 1897, still the law today.

So in regard to the punitive damage claim, we believe that it survives and can be awarded even after the death of the plaintiff.

So all that being said, I think that the reasonable -the reasonable analogies to those cases applied to this case
would indicate that we allow the jury to reach a verdict, that
we have sufficient time to brief this thereafter.

1 But I think the net result will be, upon briefing, that the jury verdict will be upheld and that the death of the 2 plaintiff should not affect that result based upon the 3 authorities we've found. 4 5 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. McClain. 6 Mr. Meador, anything else you'd like to add? 7 MR. MEADOR: No, Your Honor. When we were talking off the record, THE COURT: 8 9 Mr. Meador said it best. He had a great quote. He said this is 10 a law school exam on steroids, and I think that is so accurate. 11 So what I'm going to do is deny the motion for 12 mistrial, allow the jury to reach a verdict if they can do so. 13 And then this is obviously going to be one of many subjects on 14 post-trial motions. And I think that's clearly the best place 15 to sort it out. So I'm denying the motion for mistrial but without any 16 prejudice to either side to raise whatever issues they think are 17 appropriate in light of Mr. Kuiper's death, and we'll deal with 18 19 those on post-trial motions. 2.0 And I just wanted to thank Mr. Meador for your comments in preface to your motion all of which I basically 21 22 agreed with. And it's just a very unfortunate situation, and 23 it's clearly for me -- I mean, I'm a fairly experienced federal

But we are definitely in uncharted territory which is

24

25

district court judge.

```
1
    I think the phrase you used, Mr. Meador, and I wholeheartedly
    endorse that and hopefully will have the time to fully sort it
 2
 3
    out on post-trial motions.
               So I appreciate, Mr. Meador, you making your record
 4
 5
    and the response from Mr. McClain. And it will add to what will
 6
    surely be a very interesting post-trial motion in this case.
                                                                    So
 7
    thank you very much.
 8
              MR. MEADOR: Thank you, Your Honor.
 9
              THE COURT: Thank you.
               (Recess at 9 a.m.)
10
11
              THE COURT:
                           Thank you. Ready to have the jury brought
    in for the verdict?
12
13
              MR. MCCLAIN: Yes, Your Honor.
14
              MR. MEADOR: Yes, Your Honor.
15
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
                                 Thank you.
16
               (The jury entered the courtroom.)
17
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you. Good morning. Haven't seen
18
    you for a while. Please be seated.
19
              Mr. Storm, are you the foreperson?
2.0
              JUROR STORM: Yes, Your Honor.
21
              THE COURT: And has the jury reached a unanimous
    verdict?
22
23
              JUROR STORM: Yes, Your Honor.
24
              THE COURT:
                         Okay. Would you please hand the verdict
25
    form to my law clerk Nick? And I'm actually going to have Nick
```

go in and copy the form and then hand it out to the lawyers. So if you'd just be patient with us for a few minutes.

2.

2.0

And let me see if I can get that sun out of your eyes. That's better.

And even before I see the verdict, on behalf of the lawyers and parties to the case, I wanted -- and on behalf of all of our judges and employees of our court, I wanted to thank you very much. It obviously lasted longer than any of us expected it would. And I think you've now set a record for the length of deliberations. I know it certainly is a record in civil jury trials. And I certainly appreciate how conscientious you were in your deliberations regardless of what verdict you reached in the case.

The trial that I had that ended the day before we started this case was a two-week patent trial, very, very complex case, in many ways more complex than this. It had more documents, very complicated. And the jury deliberated two hours. And I was a little bit surprised because I would have bet anything that they would have needed to deliberate several days to consider everything in the case. But for whatever reason, they were obviously a lot smarter than I was and the lawyers because they figured out the case a lot quicker than any of us did. But I was a little bit surprised that they didn't deliberate longer. And so it was great to see how conscientious you all were in this case.

```
1
              We're just going to take a minute now and review the
 2
    verdict form.
              Could I see the lawyers at sidebar for just one
 3
 4
    second, please?
 5
              MR. MEADOR: Yes, Your Honor.
                          Thank you.
 6
              THE COURT:
 7
               (At sidebar on the record.)
              MR. MCCLAIN: Isn't it exactly eight million dollars?
 8
 9
    It's exactly what I told them I would settle for, eight million
10
    dollars on the nose I think.
11
              THE COURT: Well, you're reasonable.
                                                     I didn't see
12
    anything inconsistent in it. Did either of you see anything
13
    inconsistent in it?
14
              MR. MCCLAIN: No.
15
              THE COURT: Okay. Then I'll go ahead and thank the
16
    jury again and send them on their way; okay?
17
              MR. MCCLAIN: Do you want them polled?
              THE COURT: I'll be glad to poll them.
18
              MR. MEADOR: Okay.
19
2.0
              THE COURT: Would you like me to?
21
              MR. MEADOR: I just want to make sure they voted all
22
    eight on every question --
23
              THE COURT:
                          Yes.
24
              MR. MEADOR: -- just to double-check on that.
25
               THE COURT:
                           Well --
```

1 MR. MEADOR: I don't want to poll the whole thing. I
2 just --

THE COURT: The only thing I'm going to ask them is -the only polling I do is ask them if this is their true and
correct verdict, so let me go through it, and I'll do my normal
thing.

MR. MEADOR: That'd be great. Thank you.

(The sidebar was concluded.)

2.0

THE COURT: Here's what I'm going to do. I always -in every civil and criminal case, I poll the jury just to make
sure just as kind of a double final check that this is your
accurate verdict.

And so I'm going to go through and kind of read the verdict to all of you. And even though I have you individually sign it which is unique -- and I've been doing that for over a decade now, but I'm going to go through the verdict form. And then I'm going to ask each juror a very simple question, and the question is, is this your true and correct verdict. And so the answer is either yes or no.

And Count -- Roman numeral 1 of the verdict form, the Kuipers' claims, on each of the Kuipers' claims, in whose favor do you find? (a) would be the defective design. You found in favor of the Kuipers. (b) would be the failure to warn. You found in favor of the Kuipers. (c) would be the failure to test. You found in favor of the Kuipers. And (d) would be the

```
1
    loss of spousal consortium on behalf of Conley Kuiper, and you
    found in favor of the Kuipers.
 2.
              And then on step 2, compensatory damages, past medical
 3
    expenses, $50,000; future medical expenses reduced to present
 4
 5
    value, $500,000; past loss of function of mind and body,
 6
    $750,000; future loss of the function of mind and body reduced
 7
    to present value, 2 million dollars; past pain and suffering,
    $750,000; future pain and suffering reduced to present value, 2
 8
    million dollars.
 9
10
              Then on the loss of spousal consortium, the reasonable
11
    value of past loss of spousal consortium, $500,000; the
12
    reasonable value of future loss of spousal consortium, 1 million
13
    dollars.
14
              Step 3, punitive damages, no punitive damages awarded
15
    on any count.
16
              And then Givaudan's defenses: Untimeliness, no; state
17
    of the art, no; sophisticated user, no; comparative fault, no.
    Percentage of fault to Ron Kuiper, zero.
18
19
              No percentage of fault -- no with regard to the fault
2.0
    of released parties. And then fault of Givaudan, 100 percent,
21
    total percentage of fault assigned, 100 percent dated 9:05,
22
    today's date, 3-12-09.
23
              And we'll just start in the back of the row with
24
    Mr. Woodward.
                   Is this your true and correct verdict?
25
              JUROR WOODWARD:
                                Yes, it is, sir.
```

```
1
               THE COURT:
                           Next juror, please.
               JUROR DAMSTRA:
 2
                               Yes.
 3
               THE COURT:
                           Next, please.
               JUROR SCHIEUER:
 4
                                Yes.
 5
               THE COURT:
                           Next, please.
 6
               JUROR STORM: Yes.
 7
               THE COURT:
                           Front row, please.
               JUROR CORK:
 8
                            Yes.
 9
               JUROR GREEN: Yes.
10
               JUROR RICKERT: Yes.
11
               JUROR BESCHORNER:
                                  Yes.
12
               THE COURT:
                           Okay. On behalf of all of the parties and
13
    all of the lawyers who worked so hard in this case and
14
    personally I just wanted to thank you so much for your
15
    incredibly conscientious deliberations.
                                              I have great faith in
16
    the jury system. I think it's just a wonderful institution.
17
    And there's something about the collective wisdom of eight
18
    people that is always so much better than the wisdom of any one
19
    person, particularly me.
20
               And so I'm very glad that the jury decided this case.
21
    And you just have my utmost respect and deepest appreciation for
22
    your incredibly hard work.
23
               I know you're all anxious to get going.
                                                        You spent a
24
    bigger chunk of your life at the United States Courthouse than
25
    you thought you would. And I'm just going to meet you
```

downstairs and pass out these juror evaluation forms. 1 So again, on behalf of everybody associated with our 2. court, thank you very, very much. 3 MR. MEADOR: Your Honor, before you discharge the 4 5 jury --6 THE COURT: Yes. 7 MR. MEADOR: -- I'd just personally like to thank the 8 jury. 9 THE COURT: Absolutely. MR. MEADOR: Probably the hardest-working jury I've 10 11 ever seen in my entire career. We actually thought maybe you 12 had a good buffet down there and you wanted to come back every 13 day, but we appreciate your hard work. 14 But I also -- the reason why I wanted you to tell the 15 jurors about it at their election that they can talk to the 16 attorneys after the case. Could you just explain that to them? 17 THE COURT: Oh, yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Meador, for reminding me of that. 18 19 I allow the lawyers to call you up. You know, 2.0 notwithstanding the fact that hopefully you'll all fill out these questionnaires, mail them into us -- and we take each part 21 22 for each lawyer and mail it to that lawyer. But I allow the 23 lawyers to contact you because lawyers work very, very hard at 24 their craft. And they are always trying to do a better job in

their next trial. And they can get important feedback from you

as jurors.

2.

2.0

So here are just some of the rules. You don't have to talk to the lawyers if they call you, but I would encourage you to do so. And I'd ask you as a personal favor to take a little bit of time and answer the lawyers' questions but only if you want to.

Secondly, you shouldn't reveal any -- anything that was discussed in your deliberations by anyone else because that's considered to be kind of secret and sacrosanct, and so we want to respect the confidentiality of the jurors' deliberations.

Thirdly, if there's a question that you feel is inappropriate or for whatever reason you don't want to answer that specific question, you obviously have the right to answer the questions you want to, not answer any question that for whatever reason would make you uncomfortable or for whatever reason you simply don't want to answer it.

And, of course, if you decide that you've had enough of our federal court and you don't want to talk to anybody afterwards, you have that right too. But I would encourage you to talk to the lawyers because these are hard-working, good, well-meaning lawyers, and they're just trying to get better at their craft. And juror input is exceedingly helpful.

So anything further from the plaintiff?

MR. MCCLAIN: No, Your Honor.

```
1
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We'll be in recess.
               (The foregoing trial was
 2
 3
               concluded at 9:33 a.m.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
                                 CERTIFICATE
21
               I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
22
    from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
23
24
25
           S/Shelly Semmler
                                                 4-4-09
          Shelly Semmler, RMR, CRR
                                                  Date
```